

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

RAMON L. ESPINOZA,

Plaintiff,

v.

RICK MROCZECK, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:23-cv-00228-TLN-JDP (PS)

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE

RESPONSE DUE WITHIN FOURTEEN
DAYS

On February 20, 2024, the court dismissed plaintiff's complaint and ordered him to file an amended complaint within thirty days. ECF No. 22. To date, plaintiff has not filed an amended complaint.

To manage its docket effectively, the court imposes deadlines on litigants and requires litigants to meet those deadlines. The court may impose sanctions, including dismissing a case, for failure to comply with its orders or local rules. *See Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b); E.D. Cal. L.R. 110; Hells Canyon Pres. Council v. U.S. Forest Serv.*, 403 F.3d 683, 689 (9th Cir. 2005); *Carey v. King*, 856 F.2d 1439, 1440-41 (9th Cir. 1988).

Involuntary dismissal is a harsh penalty, but a district court has a duty to administer justice expeditiously and avoid needless burden for the parties. *See Pagtalunan v. Galaza*, 291 F.3d 639, 642 (9th Cir. 2002); *Fed. R. Civ. P. 1*.

The court will give plaintiff an opportunity to explain why this case should not be dismissed for failure to file an amended complaint. Plaintiff's failure to respond to this order will

1 constitute a failure to comply with a court order and will result in a recommendation that this
2 action be dismissed. Accordingly, plaintiff is ordered to show cause within fourteen days why
3 this case should not be dismissed for failure to prosecute and failure to comply with court orders.
4 Should plaintiff wish to continue with this lawsuit, he shall file, within fourteen days, an amended
5 complaint.

6
7 IT IS SO ORDERED.

8 Dated: April 30, 2024


9 JEREMY D. PETERSON
10 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28